

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action dated June 3, 2004. This response was necessitated by the Examiner's citation of new reasons for rejection. Currently, claims 1-18 are pending with claims 1 and 11 being independent.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,953,651 to Lu *et al.* ("Lu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,324,402 to Waugh *et al.* ("Waugh"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner rejected claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as been unpatentable over Lu in view of Waugh. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants respectfully bring to the Examiner's attention MPEP §706.07(a) which states:

*Under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by the applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p).*

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner erroneously made the action final, given that the Examiner introduced a new ground of rejection based on a new reference, namely Lu. Thus Applicants request that the finality of the action be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of the present invention discloses a method for integrating fixed terminals in a mobile telecommunications network capable of handling calls to and from registered subscribers, comprising the steps of: connecting the fixed terminals through fixed lines to an interface unit for the mobile network; providing, in the mobile telecommunications network, a register for storing, for each subscriber, subscriber information by which the subscriber is addressable; storing, as part of the subscriber information, access information specifying one or more predefined access types, that are available for that subscriber, and specifying whether or not the subscriber has multiple access to the network; and controlling the call handling within the mobile network and the call handling of calls involving at least one of the fixed terminals on the basis of the stored access information.

As a basis for his rejection of claim 1, the Examiner stated that Lu discloses a method for integrating a fixed terminal (330) in a mobile telecommunications network (CAS (300) of fig. 4 wherein the CAS is a cellular network which considered as a mobile network) for handling call between fixed terminals and mobile terminals (#370, 372, 374), comprising: connecting the fixed terminals via fixed lines (#340) to an interface unit (#250) for the mobile network (300 of fig. 4); providing a register for storing subscriber information (#254); storing, access information specifying predefined access types; and controlling the call handling on the basis of the stored access information (column 7 lines 14-43, column 10 line 36 to column 11 line 57).

However, Lu fails to disclose that the register (#254) stores information specifying whether or not the subscriber has multiple access to the network, as stated in claim 1 of the present invention. In addition, Lu fails to disclose a system in which fixed lines are integrated into a mobile network, as in the present invention. In contrast, Lu discloses a system in which a mobile adjunct system is incorporated in a wireline network (See Abstract "When subscriber management for the cellular handsets is handled by the public wired telephone network, the implementation of the cellular adjunct system is substantially simplified.")

For the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Lu and the rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 is not anticipated by Lu for at least the same reasons as with respect to claim 1, and the rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2-10 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-10 are not anticipated by Lu for at least the same reasons presented with respect to claim 1 above. The rejection to claims 2-10 is traversed and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claims 2-10.

35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Waugh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the response to the Office Action dated February 4, 2004 Applicants addressed the deficiencies of Waugh. However, the Examiner did not comment on those deficiencies. Applicants once again submit for the Examiner's consideration the deficiencies of Waugh with respect to the present invention.

Waugh fails to disclose integrating fixed devices into a wireless network. Instead, the fixed devices are connected to a wireline network and an interface unit connects the wireline network to the wireless network. Thus, there are multiple networks being managed.

Additionally, the wireless network in Waugh treats the fixed devices as mobile devices due to the interface. By contrast, the present invention distinguishes between wireless and fixed devices based on the "subscriber information". This is evidenced by the fact that the subscriber information includes "one or more predefined access types".

In Waugh, the wireless network treats the fixed access subscribers as if they are mobile subscribers. (See column 3, lines 9-13, for example.) This can be implemented by providing virtual subscriber information storing means (virtual SISM) in the interface unit. This is necessary to make sure that the terminal devices on the wireline part of the system appear to the wireless system like any other mobile telephone used on the wireless system. (See column 8, lines 35-38.)

In contrast, the mobile telecommunications network of the present invention has a register for storing subscriber information including access information that distinguishes between mobile terminal access and fixed terminal access. This enables the administration system of the mobile network to provide access type specific services. (See page 6, lines 14-17 of the application.) The access information stored as part of the subscriber information specifies one or more predefined access types.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1- 11 are not anticipated by Waugh and the rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claims 1-11.

35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Waugh. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12-18 depend from independent claim 11. For the reasons discussed above, neither Lu nor Waugh disclose all of the elements of claim 11. Waugh does not cure the deficiencies of Lu and Lu does not cure the deficiencies of Waugh. Neither discloses that the register stores information specifying whether or not the subscriber has multiple access to the network. In addition, both Lu and Waugh fail to disclose a system in which fixed lines are integrated into a mobile network, as in the present invention. Instead, Lu discloses a system in which a mobile adjunct system is incorporated in a wireline network and Waugh discloses a system where the fixed devices are connected to a wireline network via an interface unit that connects the wireline network to the wireless network.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 11, and thus claims 12-18 which depend therefrom, are not rendered obvious by either Lu, Waugh or the combination thereof and the rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejection of claims 12-18.

Other Matter

No new matter has been added.

The claims currently presented are proper and definite. Allowance is accordingly in order and respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner deem that further clarification

Express Mail Label No.; EV334318096US  
Date of Deposit: August 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: 27996-134

of the record is in order, we invite a telephone call to the Applicants' undersigned attorney to expedite further processing of the application to allowance.

Dated: August 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Richard M. Lehrer  
Reg. No. 38, 536  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS  
GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.  
Chrysler Center  
666 Third Avenue, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10017  
Tel: (212) 935-3000  
Fax: (212) 983-3115